United Nations S/2000/618

Security Council

Distr.: General
22 June 2000
English
Original: French

Letter dated 21 June 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to submit to you, and through you to the members of the Security Council, the text of an exchange of letters between the Secretariat of the United Nations and the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations extending, in the light of Security Council resolution 1302 (2000) of 8 June 2000, the Memorandum of Understanding of 20 May 1996 concerning the implementation of Security Council resolution 986 (1995) for a period of 180 days, effective 9 June 2000.

(*Signed*) Kofi A. **Annan**

00-49600 (E) 220600 220600

Letter dated 21 June 2000 from the Legal Counsel addressed to the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations

[Original: English]

I have the honour to refer to resolution 1302 (2000), adopted by the Security Council on 8 June 2000, by which the Council decided that the relevant provisions of resolution 986 (1995) would remain in force for a new period of 180 days beginning at 00.01 hours, Eastern Daylight Time, on 9 June 2000. I should also like to refer to an exchange of letters between the Secretariat of the United Nations and the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations dated 11 December 1999 extending, in the light of Security Council resolution 1281 (1999) of 10 December 1999, the Memorandum of Understanding of 20 May 1996 between the Secretariat of the United Nations and the Government of Iraq on the implementation of Security Council resolution 986 (1995) for a period of 180 days, effective 12 December 1999.

In view of the foregoing, I have the honour to propose that the provisions of the Memorandum of Understanding of 20 May 1996 be extended for an additional period of 180 days, effective 9 June 2000.

It is understood that the distribution plans which have already been approved but have not yet been implemented shall continue to apply for goods purchased with oil revenues generated under the respective Security Council resolutions.

If your Government agrees to this proposal, I suggest that this letter, and your reply thereto, shall constitute an agreement between the Secretariat of the United Nations and the Government of Iraq. This, however, does not apply to the second sentence of your reply, which is a unilateral statement by the Government.

(*Signed*) Hans **Corell**
Under-Secretary-General for Legal Affairs
The Legal Counsel

Letter dated 21 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Legal Counsel

[Original: English]

I have the honour to inform you that the Government of the Republic of Iraq agrees to the proposal contained in your letter of 21 June 2000, for the extension of the provisions of the Memorandum of Understanding of 20 May 1996 for an additional period of 180 days effective 9 June 2000. The Government of the Republic of Iraq confirms its position that it is not concerned with or committed to any arrangements or actions not provided for in the Memorandum of Understanding or not agreed upon with the Government of Iraq.

(*Signed*) Dr. Saeed **Hasan**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations

United Nations S/2000/619

Security Council

Distr.: General
22 June 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 22 June 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Ethiopia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to transmit herewith a "Memorandum of the Government of Ethiopia on the Situation Facing Ethiopian Nationals in Eritrea", issued on 22 June 2000 (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Fesseha A. **Tessema**
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

00-49918 (E) 230600

Annex to the letter dated 22 June 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Ethiopia addressed to the President of the Security Council

Memorandum of the Government of Ethiopia on the Situation Facing Ethiopian Nationals in Eritrea

1. Persistent acts of reprisal and racist incitement against Ethiopian nationals residing in Eritrea by the Eritrean Government in violation of international humanitarian law are a matter of extreme gravity and require urgent attention.

2. Reports have been received over the past few weeks that thousands of Ethiopians have been rounded up by the Eritrean authorities and herded into concentration camps around Asmara and other localities under extremely harsh conditions. The Eritrean authorities themselves do not deny their actions although they attempt to camouflage the distress that they have caused. For the most part, the International Committee of the Red Cross or other concerned agencies have not been provided access to most Ethiopian nationals, which has ensured that Ethiopians in Eritrea continue to face the most inhuman conditions. Already some reports of these conditions have been confirmed in the international media. There are also reports of killings of Ethiopian nationals in Eritrea, while the rest languish in detention in various prisons for the simple reason that they are Ethiopians.

3. What is also disturbing is the fact that in addition to the crimes referred to above, an intensive campaign of hatred and incitement against Ethiopian nationals in Eritrea is being carried out unabated. In recent days a call has been made for the internment of Ethiopians in the same way German citizens in the territories of the allied Powers were treated during the Second World War. This hate campaign is under way at a time when the ICRC continues to be denied access — as in the past two years — to Ethiopian prisoners of war in Eritrea. The international community is aware that Eritrean prisoners of war in Ethiopia have been visited regularly by the ICRC consistent with Ethiopia's commitments under international humanitarian law.

4. The grave and perilous situation in which Ethiopians find themselves in Eritrea is a matter of urgent concern to the Ethiopian Government. The conduct of the Eritrean authorities is a flagrant violation of all norms and principles of international law as well as provisions in the OAU peace proposals dealing with the need to put an end to measures "directed against the civilian population" and to refrain from "any action which can cause further hardship and suffering to each other's nationals".

5. For Eritrea's leaders to take such uncalled-for and cruel measures at a stage in the peace process when both sides have signed an agreement for the cessation of hostilities is particularly callous and deserving of the condemnation of the international community.

6. In the light of these grave dangers facing Ethiopians in Eritrea, the Ethiopian Government has felt compelled to draw the attention of the OAU to the following steps that need to be taken to protect the safety of Ethiopian nationals in Eritrea:

- Immediate and unhindered access for the ICRC and other humanitarian agencies to Ethiopians in concentration camps in Eritrea;

- Visit by an international mission to these concentration camps;
- Immediate repatriation to Ethiopia through the ICRC of Ethiopians in concentration camps in Eritrea wishing to leave, as well as other Ethiopians wishing to do so;
- Regular access for the ICRC to Ethiopian prisoners of war (POWs) in Eritrea in accordance with international humanitarian law;
- Full access for the ICRC to all prisons in Eritrea where thousands of Ethiopians are held without charge or trial only because they are Ethiopians, and their immediate repatriation to Ethiopia;
- Cessation of all hate and racist propaganda against Ethiopian nationals in Eritrea.

7. While the foregoing has already been submitted by the Government of Ethiopia formally to the OAU, Ethiopia calls also on the international community at large to understand the gravity of the situation and act accordingly.

United Nations S/2000/620

Security Council

Distr.: General
23 June 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 23 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

On instructions of my Government, I have the honour to forward the attached text of an address by President Ahmad Tejan Kabbah, to a national conference organized by the Sierra Leone Labour Congress on the status of the Lomé Peace Agreement delivered on 22 July 2000 (see annex).

I should be grateful if the present letter and its annex could be issued as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Ibrahim M. **Kamara**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

00-49924 (E) 230600

Annex to the letter dated 23 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

Keynote address by President Ahmad Tejan Kabbah to the national conference on the Lomé Peace Agreement organized by the Sierra Leone Labour Congress

Freetown, 22 June 2000

First of all, I would like to acknowledge the wise decision taken by the Sierra Leone Labour Congress, together with its partner, the American Centre for International Labour Solidarity (ACILS), to postpone this conference from May to June. The postponement was necessary because of what you rightly described as the "negative political developments in the country". That is, the flagrant violation of the Lomé Peace Agreement by the RUF, including the killing of peaceful demonstrators and the illegal detention of United Nations peacekeeping personnel.

Mr. Chairman, the events of May this year marked a turning point in the history of Sierra Leone. They brought into perspective the entire post-Lomé peace process. They also raised questions about the viability of the Lomé Peace Agreement. What, one may ask, are we supposed to do when one Party to the Agreement, namely the RUF, fails to abide by its commitment to the Agreement? How are we supposed to respond to continuing armed attacks, rapes, abductions, and other acts of terrorism by the RUF against the people of Sierra Leone? How are we supposed to react when the safety and security of our people are once again seriously threatened? What should be the reaction of the United Nations and its troop-contributing countries to the illegal detention of their peacekeepers by elements of the RUF? The actions of Mr. Foday Sankoh and some members of the RUF, especially those committed during the past few months, are tantamount to a revocation, on their part, of their commitment — that is if they had any at all — to the Lomé Peace Agreement. In other words, they are telling the world that as far as they are concerned the Lomé Agreement is meaningless. In the face of this new situation, how long should the Government and people of Sierra Leone allow Mr. Foday Sankoh and members of the RUF to maintain the benefits they derived from the provisions of the Lomé Peace Agreement? How long should they be allowed to hold the entire nation hostage while they continue to plunder our mineral resources not only to grease their war machines, but also to fill the pockets of their unscrupulous and greedy friends or partners in the West African subregion and beyond? How can anyone, in the current state of affairs, speak of a "negotiated settlement" with those who have gone all out to wreck the Lomé Peace Agreement through killings, rapes, hostage taking, and other serious violations of human rights and international humanitarian law?

Let me turn now to the Lomé Peace Agreement itself, the subject of this conference. It is important to note that the Agreement is not just a conflict management document. It is, by letter and spirit, an instrument of conflict resolution. Notwithstanding its perceived weaknesses, the Lomé Peace Agreement was intended to pave the way for stability, national reconciliation and sustainable peace in Sierra Leone. On our part, that is the Government and people in whose name I signed it, the document was a solemn commitment to take some bold and

courageous steps to end the brutal conflict once and for all. This commitment is explicitly articulated in the Preamble to the Agreement. Among other things, we expressed our determination "to establish sustainable peace and security", we pledged forthwith "to settle all past, present and future differences and grievances by peaceful means", and "to refrain from the threat and use of armed force to bring about any change in Sierra Leone". This is a very important part of the document. It is as binding on the signatories, the Government and the RUF, as the other sections of the Agreement.

Having made that statement of principles, the document goes on to spell out in detail the specific actions to be taken in order to give effect to those principles. We have consistently maintained that the Agreement is a comprehensive document, and that it should be seen as a whole. It was not signed for the sole purpose of granting the RUF amnesty or for giving its members cabinet and other high-level posts. There are provisions for monitoring the ceasefire, and for establishing a permanent ceasefire; strengthening the process of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants; ensuring the establishment of a more professional and accountable armed force for the protection of the State; alleviating the plight of refugees and the internally displaced; establishment of mechanisms for national reconciliation, rehabilitation and reconstruction; and the transformation of the rebel movement into a political party.

Let me remind you that the basis of the 1999 Lomé Agreement was in fact the 1996 Abidjan Accord. The question of amnesty or immunity for example, was not new. Article 15 of the 1996 Abidjan Accord stated, and I quote: "To consolidate the peace and promote the cause of national reconciliation, the Government of Sierra Leone shall ensure that no official or judicial action is taken against any member of the RUF/SL in respect of anything done by them in pursuit of their objectives as members of that organization up to the time of the signing of this Agreement ..." Unquote. In other words, three years later, Mr. Sankoh and the RUF were given a second chance, indeed a reprieve. By their actions since Lomé, Mr. Sankoh and many in the RUF leadership have trampled on that document. They have virtually torn the Lomé Peace Agreement. I can assure you that we are going to pick up the pieces.

Mr. Chairman, we have every reason to renounce our obligations under the Agreement and unilaterally declare them null and void. However, it would be irresponsible on our part to do so. In fact such a course of action would be detrimental to the safety and welfare of our people, and inconsistent with their desire, indeed their right to live in peace and security.

I would therefore take this opportunity to announce that while in principle we remain committed to the Lomé Peace Agreement, we reserve the right not to be bound by *all* its provisions. However, because it is an instrument for sustainable peace, and because it contains, generally speaking, strategies for achieving some of the principal objectives of our post-conflict programmes, we shall take a selective approach towards its implementation. From now on, we shall unilaterally, but carefully make our own assessment of the situation and determine which of the provisions are still valid, those that have been rendered obsolete by recent developments, and those that should, in the best interest of this nation be implemented.

We shall also set our own priorities. The security and humanitarian provisions of the Agreement will be our primary concern. For instance we attach special importance to the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants — an activity which we had already launched long before the Lomé Peace Agreement, under the National Resettlement, Rehabilitation, and Reconstruction Programme (NRRRP). In this regard, we have left the door open for ex-combatants, especially those of the RUF, who want real peace, to come forward now and take advantage of the DDR programme before it is too late. Their safety is assured. I should add here that we shall faithfully abide by the relevant provisions in the document for national reconciliation.

Implementation of article XVII of the Agreement, namely, the provision on the restructuring and training of a truly loyal national armed force is also at the top of the agenda. At the same time, we shall continue to accord particular attention to the problem of child soldiers, and the need to mobilize international assistance for the proposed special fund for war victims.

Mr. Chairman, the Lomé Peace Agreement is not a perfect document. I must admit that there are provisions which, under other circumstances, we would not have accepted. However, we did what we had to do at that particular point in time, and without any apology. As I told the nation on the eve of the signing ceremony, the government delegation had participated in the peace talks in good faith. In response to the collective will of the majority of the people, the government delegation was determined to bring home a comprehensive agreement, one that would not only silence the guns of war temporarily, but would ensure lasting peace and security for all Sierra Leoneans. I should also point out that the Agreement was reached in the context of certain subregional, regional and international imperatives. In other words, while it was an agreement between the Government and the RUF, it had international implications. Some of these have manifested themselves in actions already taken or are now being contemplated by the international community, including the United Nations Security Council.

There was nothing really wrong with the Lomé Peace Agreement, per se. The problem was the lack of commitment on the part of Mr. Foday Sankoh and some members of the RUF leadership to fulfil their obligations under the Agreement. This is the crux of the matter. This conference may wish to examine in depth the implications of the serious violations of the Agreement by the RUF. As active members of civil society, I look forward to hearing your views on this important issue.

I thank you for your attention and wish you success in your deliberations.

United Nations S/2000/621

Security Council

Distr.: General
23 June 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 23 June 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Yugoslavia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have been instructed by my Government to lodge the strongest protest over the refusal to allow me to participate in the meeting of the Security Council on the Balkans on 23 June 2000.

As a country situated in the central part of the Balkans and a signatory party and a guarantor of the Dayton-Paris Agreement, as well as a country with the agreement of which the international civil and military presences have been deployed in a part of its territory, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has more right than any other country to participate in the meeting of the Security Council. However, it has had that right denied on the basis of a procedural decision. While all other States Members of the United Nations that requested to participate in the meeting were allowed to do so, my country was prevented even though it had an evident and a very strong interest in its debate.

The request of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to participate in the work of the Security Council was legitimate and along the lines of the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, i.e., the right of every State to participate in the work of the Security Council dealing with issues of its immediate concern. The rejection of the request of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is discriminatory and contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Vladislav **Jovanovic**
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

00-49930 (E) 230600

United Nations S/2000/622

Security Council

Distr.: General
22 June 2000
English
Original: Arabic

Identical letters dated 21 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council

I refer to the letter dated 23 May 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Kuwait to the United Nations addressed to you (S/2000/478) and to our letter dated 26 May 2000 responding to that letter (S/2000/502). On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to inform you that on 19 June 2000 Mr. Mohammed Said Al-Sahaf, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, addressed a letter (see annex) to Mr. Azzedine Laraki, Secretary-General of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), seeking clarification of the facts concerning the matter of the alleged paper annexed to the Kuwaiti letter, representing as it does a deliberate affront to OIC, an abuse of the privilege of having documents circulated within the United Nations system and a shoddy attempt to politicize the missing persons issue and deprive it of its humanitarian character.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Saeed H. **Hasan**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

00-49936 (E) 260600 260600

Annex to the identical letters dated 21 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council

Letter dated 19 June 2000 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq addressed to the Secretary-General of the Organization of the Islamic Conference

I should like to refer to the fact that on 23 May 2000 the Permanent Mission of Kuwait to the United Nations addressed a questionable letter to the President of the Security Council transmitting what was alleged to be a position paper by the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) on what it called "the issue of the Kuwaiti and third-country prisoners and missing persons in Iraq" and "the efforts that have been made by OIC over the past nine years in seeking to resolve this humanitarian issue" and requesting circulation as a document of the Security Council (copy attached). The letter in question and its dubious annex were then indeed circulated as a document of the Council (S/2000/478).

Our Permanent Representative in New York responded in an appropriate manner to this questionable conduct with a letter addressed to the President of the Security Council that was circulated as document S/2000/502. He stated that Kuwait's letter and its annex, "in addition to constituting an abuse of the right of States to request circulation of documents by the United Nations and undermining the credibility of OIC, represents an underhand and selective attempt to politicize the missing persons issue". At the same time, our Permanent Representative in New York also sought clarification from the OIC Permanent Observer there. Regrettably, we have received from him and from you only verbal assurances that the paper was no more than a set of "talking points" drawn up by an official of the OIC secretariat in connection with a visit by the organization's Secretary-General to Kuwait and that it has no official or legal standing. You have yet to issue any official statement clarifying your position with respect to the deliberate affront to OIC that was committed by Kuwait, and we view this as an attempt to avoid telling the whole truth.

As is customary with the rulers of Kuwait, this opportunistic and questionable behaviour on the part of Kuwait has the goal of politicizing the missing persons issue and exploiting OIC for devious purposes that are not at all in keeping with the rules that govern the functioning of the organization. It damages the organization's credibility, which requires it to adopt a position of neutrality on issues that arise between two of its members, and it is incompatible with the norms and procedures of diplomatic conduct. The manner in which you have addressed this dubious Kuwaiti conduct is also not at all in keeping with the requirements of the OIC Charter in terms of the principles of impartiality, the objective consideration of controversial issues and the rejection of interference and pressure. The Government of Iraq therefore believes that you owe it to all the members of OIC and that you have the duty, stemming from your responsibility to them, to clarify this matter and the circumstances in which it arose. That the representative of Kuwait at the United Nations refused the request of the OIC secretariat not to have the position paper circulated as a document of the Security Council is a violation of the organization's character as a legal entity, and this requires a resolute response on your part since

the position paper has no legal or official standing. Hence we request you to respond to this action, to tell the whole truth and to disclose the true position. The secretariat would be well advised to clarify that position so that member States can be apprised of it before the twenty-seventh session of the Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers convenes.

I should also like in this connection to call your attention to a fact that is of the utmost importance, and that is that Iraq has provided all the assistance required to resolve the issue of missing Kuwaitis and third-country nationals and has done so from purely humanitarian motives. It released 7,023 Kuwaiti and third-country prisoners of war immediately on the cessation of the 30-Power aggression against Iraq in March 1991, according to data from the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). Iraq also participated in the work of the Tripartite Commission and its Technical Subcommittee, which ceased to operate with the Anglo-American aggression against Iraq in December 1998, and in the efforts made to determine the fate of missing persons of all nationalities. Iraq processed more than 300 dossiers and many other cases were settled, so that the number of missing persons whose fate Kuwait is seeking to establish fell from 627 to 598 as a result of the sincere efforts made by Iraq. It should also be said that Iraq has always been ready to attend the meetings of the Tripartite Commission and the Technical Subcommittee if they are also attended by the parties that actually have cases of missing persons. Kuwait, however, refuses to reinstate these two bodies without the presence of representatives of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France, none of whose nationals are missing.

I should like in this connection to call your attention to the fact that OIC should also attend to the matter of the missing Iraqis. ICRC has missed no opportunity to affirm that the Geneva Conventions of 1949 on the treatment of prisoners of war and on civilian persons do not distinguish between one prisoner of war and another or between one missing person and another. As the sponsor of all the activities relating to this matter, ICRC constantly stresses the equal status of Iraqi and Kuwaiti missing persons. We believe that the time has come for OIC to adopt the same course so that it can demonstrate its credibility and that it is above narrow political considerations and so that it can begin to ask the rulers of Kuwait to provide information on the 1,150 missing Iraqis on whom their authorities are refusing to provide any information.

I request the OIC secretariat to have this letter circulated to the States members of the organization.

(*Signed*) Mohammed Said **Al-Sahaf**
Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq

United Nations S/2000/623

Security Council

Distr.: General
23 June 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 21 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to request that the Security Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedures to His Excellency Dr. Hussein Hassouna, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations, to participate in the Council's forthcoming discussions on the situation in Somalia.

(*Signed*) Said **Ben Mustapha**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

00-49942 (E) 260600

United Nations A/54/927–S/2000/624

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
26 June 2000
English
Original: Arabic

General Assembly
Fifty-fourth session
Agenda item 43
The situation in the Middle East

Security Council
Fifty-fifth year

Letter dated 24 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

On instructions from my Government, I have to inform you that on 24 June 2000 Israeli troops opened fire on a Jordanian trade union delegation that was visiting the Lebanese border at the so-called Fatimah Gate, wounding four of its members.

Lebanon regards this act as a provocation and as a breach of its sovereignty, its territorial integrity and its internationally recognized boundaries. It also views it as a violation of the terms of the report of the Secretary-General of 16 June 2000 (S/2000/590) and of the statement by the President of the Security Council of 18 June 2000 (S/PRST/2000/21), in which the Council notes with serious concern the Israeli violations that have occurred since 16 June 2000.

In view of the dangers arising out of this situation, Lebanon urges you to take the measures necessary to put a definitive end to the Israeli violations and to bring the delicate situation they have created to the attention of the Security Council in order to avert further incidents and injuries.

I request you to have this letter circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 43, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Sélim **Tadmoury**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

00-50062 (E) 260600 260600

United Nations S/2000/625

Security Council

Distr.: General
26 June 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 24 June 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Yugoslavia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have been instructed by my Government to lodge the strongest protest over your decision to allow the circulation of a non-paper of a self-styled representative of a federal unit of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, a Member State of the United Nations, through the offices of the Republic of Slovenia, another Member State of the United Nations, as a document of the Security Council.

The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is represented at the United Nations only by its Permanent Mission, so that it is absolutely unacceptable and contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and international law to allow any part of a sovereign country to communicate with the Security Council and have documents circulated, as that right is reserved exclusively for independent sovereign States.

Making it possible for the Republic of Slovenia to circulate in the annex to its letter of 21 June 2000 (S/2000/611) the non-paper of the self-styled representative of Montenegro constitutes a most drastic violation of the principle of the Charter of the United Nations and the rules of procedure of the Security Council. In that way, the Republic of Slovenia has interfered directly in the internal affairs of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which is a dangerous provocation for peace and security in the region and beyond. There is no reason, and it is entirely unacceptable, for the Republic of Slovenia to figure as a "representative" of Montenegro which is an equal federal unit of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. This act is also directed against the people of Montenegro which, at a referendum, opted for the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, a common State with the Republic of Serbia. Slovenia is not the mother country of the Montenegrin people to have a justified interest in the internal question of Serbia and Montenegro.

It is a question of interest, as well as of great concern, as to who has authorized the self-styled representative of Montenegro to violate the Constitution of Montenegro by raising the issue through the offices of a foreign State. Montenegro has sufficient mechanisms to protect its interests at Republic and Federal levels.

In accordance with the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and international law, diplomatic and consular missions of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia represent it in other countries and in the United Nations and other international organizations. It is evident that the Republic of Slovenia has been most blatantly instrumentalized for the destabilization of Montenegro and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. It serves the war-mongering goals of the United States of

00-50228 (E) 260600

America and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), contrary to the interest of the Montenegrin people, as well as all the peoples of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. What is involved is an altogether transparent and recognizable scenario which was also implemented to break up the previous Yugoslavia.

Bearing that in mind, the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia calls upon the Security Council to prevent its own abuse for interference in the internal affairs of the Member States of the United Nations, contrary to the basic provisions of its Charter.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Vlasdislav **Jovanovic**
Chargé d'Affaires a.i.